

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/848,048	05/03/2001	John E. McGunnigle	102088-0001	5582	
²⁴²⁶⁷ CESARI AND	7590 01/11/2007 MCKENNA, LLP	EXAM	EXAMINER		
88 BLACK FALCON AVENUE			DAO, MINH D		
BOSTON, MA 02210			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•	2618		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	ONTHS	01/11/2007	PAF	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,048	MCGUNNIGLE, JOHN E.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	MINH D. DAO	2618
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Oct This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims	•	
 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	,	
Application Papers		·
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/18/06with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1,7,8,14 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Cantwell (US 5,917,827).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry (5,590,396) in view of Cantwell (US 5,917,827).

Regarding claim 1, Henry teaches a microwave communication network that overlays a public switched telephone network comprising (See figure 1; also see col. 3, lines 59-67 and col. 4, lines 1-19):

a plurality of microwave transceivers (Figure 1, item108A, 108B; In addition, items 108A and 108B each inherently includes a transceiver in order transmit and receive information) forming a microwave network (Figure 1, items 107,110, 113, 114 108A, 108) which overlays the public switched telephone network (Figure 1, items 105), the transceivers being geographically located so as to provide a wireless interoffice facility (IOF) between two or more central offices, tandem switches or other premises controlled by an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) (Figure 1, items 107 via microwave link 108). However, Henry does not disclose that the wireless interoffice facility is for carrying all types of traffic normally carried by the PSTN. Cantwell, in an analogous art, teaches interoffice trunks between two inter-exchange tandem switches using transmission technologies such as satellite, microwave, coaxial or fiber optic systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Cantwell to Henry in order for the combined system to support different interface signals in different formats without having to replace or upgrade existing switching equipment as taught by Cantwell (see col. 2, lines 34-38).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Henry and Cantwell teaches the microwave communication network as in claim 1 wherein one or more of the microwave transceivers is located proximate to one or more of the central offices, tandem switches or other premises (See Henry, figure 1, the link between items 108A(microwave facility) and 107(MTSO)).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Henry and Cantwell teaches the microwave

communication network as in claim 1 wherein the ILEC provides insufficient wireline

bandwidth between two or more of the central offices, tandem switches or other

premises, and the microwave network provides wireless bandwidth as an alternative

communication path (see Cantwell, col. 1, lines 16-57).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Henry and Cantwell teaches that the microwave

communication network as in claim 1 wherein the wireless IOF provides redundancy to

the public switched telephone network (see Henry, Figure 1, links 117 and 108; col. 4,

lines 8-12).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Henry and Cantwell also teaches that the

microwave communication network as in claim 1 wherein the wireless IOF provides

bandwidth at a lower cost than the public switched telephone network (see Cantwell,

col. 1, lines 16-57). It is also well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that the cost of

providing wireless service in general is less than the cost to build up a wireline network.

Regarding claim 6, the claim is interpreted the same as claim 5, therefore is rejected for

the same reason set forth in claim 5.

Page 5

Regarding claim 7, the combination of Henry and Cantwell teaches a method of providing wireless bandwidth in a microwave network (see Henry, figure 1, items 107,110,114,106,108A, 108) which overlays a public switched telephone network (see Henry, figure 1, items 105) comprising the steps of (see Henry, figure 1, and it is also well known in the art that the microwave link 108 should operate within the FCC allocated wireless bandwidth):

- (1) forming a microwave network from a plurality of microwave transceivers (see Henry, Figure 1, item108A, 108B; In addition, items 108A and 108B each obviously includes a transceiver in order transmit and receive information); the microwave network overlaying the public switched telephone network (see Henry, figure 1; also see col. 3, lines 59-67 and col. 4, lines 1-19);
- (2) geographically arranging the transceivers so as to provide wireless interoffice facility (1017) between two or more central offices, tandem switches or other premises controlled by an incumbent local a change carrier (ILEC) (see Henry, Figure 1, items 107 via microwave link 108). However, Henry does not disclose that the wireless interoffice facility is for carrying all types of traffic normally carried by the PSTN. Cantwell, in an analogous art, teaches interoffice trunks between two inter-exchange tandem switches using transmission technologies such as satellite, microwave, coaxial or fiber optic systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Cantwell to Henry in order for the combined system to support different interface signals in

different formats without having to replace or upgrade existing switching equipment as taught by Cantwell (see col. 2, lines 34-38).

Regarding claim 8, Henry teaches a microwave communication network that overlays a public switched telephone network comprising (See figure 1; also see col. 3, lines 59-67 and col. 4, lines 1-19): a plurality of microwave transceivers (Figure 1, item108A, 108B; In addition, items 108A and 108B each inherently includes a transceiver in order transmit and receive information) forming a microwave network (Figure 1, items 107,110, 113, 114 108A, 108) which overlays the public switched telephone network (Figure 1, items 105), the transceivers being geographically located to provide a wireless interoffice facility (IOF) between one or more central offices, tandem switches or other premises controlled by an incumbent local exchange carrier (ILEC) (Figure 1, items 107 via microwave link 108) and one or more central offices, tandem switches or other premises controlled a common carrier other than the (ILEC) (Figure 1, items 103,102). However, Henry does not disclose that the wireless interoffice facility is for carrying all types of traffic normally carried by the PSTN. Cantwell, in an analogous art, teaches interoffice trunks between two inter-exchange tandem switches using transmission technologies such as satellite, microwave, coaxial or fiber optic systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Cantwell to Henry in order for the combined system to support different interface signals in different formats without

having to replace or upgrade existing switching equipment as taught by Cantwell (see

col. 2, lines 34-38).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Henry and Cantwell teaches that the microwave

communication network as in claim 8 wherein one or more of the microwave

transceivers is located proximate to one or more of the central offices, tandem switches

or other premises (See Henry, figure 1, the link between items 108A(microwave facility)

and 107(MTSO)).

Regarding claim 10, the claim is interpreted the same as claim 3, therefore is rejected

for the same reason set forth in claim 3.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Henry and Cantwell teaches that the microwave

communication network as in claim 8 wherein the wireless IOF provides redundancy to

the public switched telephone network (See Henry, Figure 1, links 117 and 108; col. 4,

lines 8-12).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Henry and Cantwell teaches that the microwave

communication network as in claim 8 wherein the wireless IOF provides bandwidth at a

lower cost than the public switched telephone network (see Cantwell, col. 1, lines 16-

57). It is also well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that the cost of providing

wireless service in general is less than the cost to build up a wireline network.

Page 8

Regarding claim 13, the claim is interpreted the same as claim 12, therefore is rejected

for the same reason set forth in claim 12.

Regarding claim 14, Henry teaches a method of providing wireless bandwidth in a

microwave network (figure 1, items 107,110,114,106,108A,108) which overlays a public

switched telephone network (figure 1, items 105) comprising the steps of (See figure 1,

and it is also well known in the art that the microwave link 108 should operate within the

FCC allocated wireless bandwidth):

(1) forming a microwave network from a plurality of microwave transceivers

(Figure 1, item108A, 108B; In addition, items 108A and 108B each inherently includes a

transceiver in order transmit and receive information); the microwave network

overlaying the public switched telephone network (See figure 1; also see col. 3, lines

59-67 and col. 4, lines 1-19);

(2) geographically arranging the transceivers so as to provide wireless interoffice facility

(1017) between two or more central offices, tandem switches or other premises

controlled by an incumbent local a change carrier (ILEC) (Figure 1, items 107 via

microwave link 108) and one or more central offices, tandem switches or other premise

controlled by a common carrier other than the ILEC (figure 1, items 103,102). However,

Henry does not disclose that the wireless interoffice facility is for carrying all types of

traffic normally carried by the PSTN. Cantwell, in an analogous art, teaches interoffice

trunks between two inter-exchange tandem switches using transmission technologies

such as satellite, microwave, coaxial or fiber optic systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Cantwell to Henry in order for the combined system to support different interface signals in different formats without having to replace or upgrade existing switching equipment as taught by Cantwell (see col. 2, lines 34-38).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH D. DAO whose telephone number is 571-272-7851. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW ANDERSON can be reached on 571-272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/848,048 Page 10

Art Unit: 2618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Minh Dao 1477 AU 2618 January 05, 2007 Matthew Anderson Superviser AU 2618